

Jaydev A. Jani and Peter Schreiner*

Authorship and Authority in the Sanskrit Literary Tradition of the Swaminarayana Movement: Śikṣāpatrī and Satsaṅgijīvanam

DOI 10.1515/asia-2015-0053

Abstract: This paper presents what the Satsaṅgijīvanam, a text by Śātānanda-Muni about the life and teachings of Sahajānanda, the founder of the Swaminarayana Movement, in two different passages reports about the authorship of the Śikṣāpatrī. It would appear that Swaminarayana (the name by which the founder came to be known) wrote the Śikṣāpatrī well before Śātānanda produced the version included in the Satsaṅgijīvanam. What the Satsaṅgijīvanam tells us about the authorship and the process of transmission of the Satsaṅgijīvanam itself complicates the evaluation of the Satsaṅgijīvanam as a historical document. Yet, the fact that the text shows that Swaminarayana may *not* be the author of the currently known Śikṣāpatrī invites reflection about the function of texts in the traditional self-perception and in the history of the Swaminarayana Movement.

Keywords: Swaminarayana movement, Hinduism, Śikṣāpatrī, Satsaṅgijīvanam, authorship of translations

1 Introduction

The term authorship as used in the title refers to the writing or more generally to the process of production and attribution of texts. The problem and concept of authorship can, however, be complicated in case of multiple authorship or of authorized revision (translation included) and is thereby linked to the concept of authority as an instance before and around the actual text and its wording. If a politician employs ghost writers to formulate his speeches, he or she is not the author of the text, but the politician authorizes it. Or if the Koran was dictated to Mohammed by a heavenly voice, then the prophet may not be considered the author. If Purāṇas are attributed to Vyāsa we do not have an author but only the

***Corresponding author: Peter Schreiner**, University of Zürich, Department of Indian Studies, Rämistr. 59, CH-8001, Zürich. E-mail: peter.schreiner@aoi.uzh.ch

Jaydev A. Jani, Department of Sanskrit, M. S. University of Baroda, Vadodara, India. E-mail: jaydevj@yahoo.com

authority linked to a name and to a textual tradition. And if later poets use “Kabir” as a name-seal in their verses they appropriate and identify with an author and his literary technique and message.

The concept of “authority” is among the tools to describe and classify and compare the role of texts in religious traditions. In this paper we shall examine what two texts from the Sanskrit literary tradition of the Swaminarayana Movement, the Śikṣāpatrī and the Satsaṅgijīvanam, tell us about their authorship. Our approach is *philological* and it is *text-immanent*; its textual analysis is only concerned with the Satsaṅgijīvanam and the Śikṣāpatrī. Thus, we shall not expand on *theoretical* discussions on concepts like authorship, authority, textuality, canonization, etc. Our method and perspective obviously may also differ from an emic perspective.¹

The Swaminarayana Movement derives its name from the name of its founder (1781–1830) who was born as Ghanaśyāma in a Brahmin family in Chapiya near Ayodhya and left home at the age of 11 (after the parents’ death). He wandered through India known by the name Nīlakaṇṭha until he was initiated by one Swami Rāmānanda (1739–1802) to become Swami Sahajānanda. Swami Rāmānanda shortly afterwards (in 1801) made the young swami his successor. To his followers Swami Sahajānanda is Swaminarayana, an embodiment of Kṛṣṇa, the personal absolute. His movement spread in Gujarat and was organized in two dioceses (Vāḍtal and Ahmedabad) under the guidance of two *ācāryas* (the founder’s nephews, their function being hereditary among their descendants). A new branch, the B.A.P.S. (Bocāsaṇavāsī Akṣara Puruṣottama Saṁsthā), originated in 1907 (by separation from Vāḍtal) and has become the internationally perhaps most

¹ This contribution aims at presenting the textual basis for the theoretical problems of a specific case of interlocked multiple authorship of a holy text. Its scope is that of a case study; it is neither an analysis of the Śikṣāpatrī nor a comprehensive analysis of the Satsaṅgijīvanam. The paper also does not include any comparative approach even though certain parallels and differences in other religions or traditions clearly invite or even demand comparison. These limitations explain the deliberate limitation of the bibliography. The evidence of the Satsaṅgijīvanam may have raised theoretical reflections in the exegesis of the texts and may have been dealt with in the commentarial literature of the Movement’s branches, but such reflections and exegesis do also not fall within the scope of the paper. In order to contextualize this paper a study of the role of texts in general in the Swaminarayana Movement, including the study of the selection of quasi-canonical authoritative texts and of the frequency of references to and quotations from these texts, further a study of the importance of public or private recitation of texts, and of the function of textualized (originally oral) instructions by the founder in religious practice would all be required and presupposed. The question whether and how the Swaminarayana Movement could be considered “a religion of the book” addresses the wider horizon of the title question.

visible representative of the Swaminarayana Sampradāya.² The movement is committed to religious reform (especially of Kaula practices current at the time of Swaminarayana), but at the same time propagates the conservation of traditional values and practices. It is a movement with particular, perhaps unique and characteristic traits in its theological and philosophical thinking.

Śikṣāpatrī and Satsaṅgijīvanam are two important texts in the Sanskrit literary tradition of the Swaminarayana Movement. The Śikṣāpatrī, attributed to Swaminarayana himself, summarizes the rules of conduct for his followers and has been considered as a catechism and Holy Scripture in the Swaminarayana Movement. It is a Sanskrit text in 212 verses. In the second verse the author identifies himself: “I, Sahajānandasvāmī, write this ‘letter of instructions’ while staying in Vṛttālaya (i. e., Vaṭtal) to all my followers living in different regions (or countries).” In the conclusion the followers are admonished to live in conformance to these instructions and to read this text daily; those who are illiterate should listen to its recitation or at least venerate it (probably as a ‘book’ or manuscript) in the conviction that “my word is a form of mine” (*madrūpam iti madvāṇī mānyeyam*, v. 209).³

To judge from the availability of printed editions and commentaries, this text generally seems to be considered as an independent work.⁴ This aspect of the reception history is likely to have been established by Śatānanda who not only incorporated the Śikṣāpatrī in the Satsaṅgijīvanam, but wrote an extensive Sanskrit commentary on the Śikṣāpatrī. In spite of the fact that the other primary scriptural source besides the Śikṣāpatrī attributed to Swaminarayana, the *Vacanāmṛta* (a collection of speeches given by Swaminarayana to his followers and collected

2 For background information about the history of the movement and its teachings see Williams 1984.

3 The verses can roughly be grouped according to subject matter:

- 1–10 Origin and intention of the text;
- 11–122 Rules of conduct applicable to everybody;
- 123–134 Dharma of the ācāryas and their wives;
- 135–156 Householders;
- 157–158 Kings;
- 159–174 Conduct of women (married women, widows);
- 175–187 Instructions concerning celibates;
- 188–196 Instructions concerning sādhus;
- 197–202 Dharma common to celibates and sādhus;
- 203–212 Conclusion.

4 The English as well as the Gujarati translations which the authors happened to see – and we admittedly made no effort to establish a publication history or a bibliography of editions – include the Sanskrit verses.

and edited by monks close to him), is in Gujarati, Swaminarayana is generally supposed to be the author of these Sanskrit verses. The impression of the Śikṣāpatrī as an independent text written by Swaminarayana, however, is questioned by what the Satsaṅgijīvanam itself tells about its origin. Thus, only when, in the course of our research on the literary Sanskrit tradition of the Swaminarayana Movement,⁵ we came across the Śikṣāpatrī as a chapter in the Satsaṅgijīvanam, the problem of authorship had to be considered or reconsidered.⁶

The reputation and importance of the Śikṣāpatrī as a Holy Scripture is not extended to the Satsaṅgijīvanam (abbreviated SSJ). The latter is a large text in five parts (comprising 319 chapters and 16,493 verses) narrating Swaminarayana's biography and presenting his teachings.⁷ It was commissioned by the founder

⁵ See above, Acknowledgements.

⁶ That the discovery of the Śikṣāpatrī in the Satsaṅgijīvanam came as a surprise only reflects the authors' ignorance; very likely any insider interested in and informed about the history of the Movement could have told us; but in fact, nobody did.

⁷ The size of the text makes it difficult to summarize its outline and content. The first part (*prakaraṇa*) introduces the dialogue setting and Śātānanda as author; it speaks about Swaminarayana's parents and about the miseries caused by the predominance of *adharma* as cause for Swaminarayana's manifestation. Chapters 1,11–16 relate the parents' meeting with Rāmānanda, Swaminarayana's teacher, 17–22 narrate their pilgrimage to Vṇḍāvāna and Swaminarayana's birth. 1,23–36 concern his childhood and training; 1,37–42 narrate the parents' death and the child's departure from home. 1,43–50 summarize his wanderings and victories over demons and other adversaries until the arrival in Loj. 1,51–60 concern the meeting with the followers of Swami Rāmānanda and the initiation by the Swami until the latter's death. The second part (52 chapters) narrates about Swaminarayana's travels through Gujarat and about his winning followers and the support of different "kings" through his instructions. Part 3 consists largely of descriptions of celebrations: 3,4–22 food-festival; 3,23–45 Prabodhinī-festival; 3,46–64 Swing-festival in Vṛttālaya. Part 4 summarizes Swaminarayana's instruction and regulations concerning the recitation of Purāṇas (4,1–9), the celebration of the Janmāṣṭamī-festival in Sāraṅgapura (4,10–12), the visit to Kāryāyāṇa and Nāgaṭaṅka (4,13–19), the celebration of the Swing-festival in Pañcāla and the return to Durgapura (4,20–23); chapter 4,24 relates about Swaminarayana's intentions concerning the organization of the movement and his succession, viz., through construction of temples (4,25–33, glorifying Vṛttālaya in particular), appointment of ācāryas (narrated in 4,40), and the writing of the Śikṣāpatrī, narrated in 4,44. There is a report about a theological discussion about the meaning of *trīyuga* (4,34–38) and there are detailed instructions about different kinds of initiation (4,46–54); the next sections regulate the celebration of festivals (4,55–61) and the conduct of monks (4,62–67); part 4 ends with an exposition on cosmology, largely along Sāṃkhya lines (4,68–73). Part 5 begins with an extensive section with instructions about dharma (5,1–29, 30–37 concerning women, 38–54 concerning stages of life with 5,41–48 on expiation); 5,56–65 is an exposition on yoga. 5,67 describes the power of the images installed by Swaminarayana, chapter 68 narrates about his demise, 69 instructs about the Harijayantī-vow, i. e., the observation of Swaminarayana's birthday. The work concludes with a list of its contents (5,70).

and written during his life-time by Swami Śatānanda. It also contains details about the writing of the Śikṣāpatrī and its incorporation in the Satsaṅgijīvanam which invite reflection about the applicability of the concept of authorship with regard to the Sanskrit text of the Śikṣāpatrī.

The problem to be studied in the following as a historical question can be summarized very concisely: The Śikṣāpatrī is attributed to Swaminarayana as its author. The author of the Satsaṅgijīvanam is Śatānanda-Muni. At the same time, however, the authoritative version of the Śikṣāpatrī is contained in the Satsaṅgijīvanam and could thus also be considered to have been authored by Śatānanda.

We restrict ourselves to the presentation of three passages from the Satsaṅgijīvanam on the origin of Satsaṅgijīvanam and of the Śikṣāpatrī. The first deals with the authorship and characteristics of the Satsaṅgijīvanam itself; the second and third are the two episodes in the Satsaṅgijīvanam which report about the origin of the Śikṣāpatrī. The passages address problems concerning claims of authorship, including the possibility of joint authorship, delegated authorship and (marginally) the problem of how translation from one language to another affects authorship. This will lead, in the conclusion, to questions and prospects for further research, both historical and conceptual.⁸

2 The Satsaṅgijīvanam on the Satsaṅgijīvanam

Most of what the Satsaṅgijīvanam tells us about its authorship and process of transmission is contained in its first three chapters. They mention many details about the text of which they form the beginning.

Verses 17–22 of the first chapter⁹ identify the Satsaṅgijīvanam as a work by Śatānanda. As the essence of all Vedas, it propounds the dharma of absolute devotion (*aikāntikadharmā*), and boasts the ability to cause liberation from the

⁸ The authors do not lay claim to the commitment and perspective with which insiders of the movement might approach these questions. One would have to take into account that the different branches of the movement might view the historical information contained in the Satsaṅgijīvanam with conflicting loyalties. We are not aware of initiatives based on an “ecumenical” interest in the text of the Satsaṅgijīvanam among the branches of the movement.

⁹ I.e. Satsaṅgijīvanam 1.1.17–22. Full references to the text consist of three parts, representing part, chapter and verse(s). The Sanskrit original of summarized or translated passages is given in the footnotes. The digitalization of the Satsaṅgijīvanam in Sanskrit and an English summary of its contents were produced by the project referred to in footnote 5 and the Acknowledgements.

bonds of existence. It is like a boat and describes the life of the Son of Dharma, i. e., Swaminarayana. Only the good derive from it merit and freedom from evil. The last two verses praise the work as an ornament of its poet.¹⁰

Since Śātānanda is mentioned as the author, it may be assumed that it is he who is speaking. However, the first chapter then presents a dialogue situation which presupposes the existence of the finished work, since the dialogue belongs to the text recited in that dialogue by a Suvrata to a king; a Satsaṅgijīvanam is inserted into a Satsaṅgijīvanam.¹¹ The request by the king and Suvrata's recitation are part of the history of what happened with the completed Satsaṅgijīvanam (cf. 1,3.49–50). The work was heard rather than read. If one accepts Śātānanda as its author, it must be Śātānanda who invented the recitation of his work by Suvrata, perhaps as part of making his work conform to purāṇic conventions. At the time of writing the frame story, the recitation of the finished work would be a future event. Hence, in a perspective of literary analysis, it is clearly an invented event or fiction.

-
- 10 *śrīmacchatānandakṛte 'tra ramye |*
saṁdarbhasāre 'khilavedasāraḥ |
suspaṣṭam aikāntikadharmā uktaḥ |
syād yena sadyo bhavaṇpāśamukṭiḥ || 1,1.17 |
sākṣād dharau sakalalokagurau rasāyā |
antarhite nanu mumukṣujanāikabandhau |
nistāraṇāya laghu saṁśṛtiśāgarasya |
naukedaṁ eva bhuvi mānavadehabhājām || 1,1.18 |
līlāraso hi sakalo 'mṛtadivyaṁūrteḥ |
svecchānarākṛtidhṛto bhuvi dharmasūnoḥ |
satsaṅginām paramajīvanam asty ato 'sau |
saṁyañ nirūpita iheti sa pīyatām taiḥ || 1,1.19 |
etat puṇyam alaṁpavitram amalām saddharmaśāstrām param |
dharmajñānavirāgabhakti nibhṛtaṁ sevyam satām nityadā |
pāpauḥpraśamaṁ nṛṇām kalimalaprakṣālanam sarvathā |
jādyadvāntanivāraṇam sukṛtibhiḥ saṁprāpyate netaraiḥ || 1,1.20 |
sakaladharmavinirṇayam aṅgasā |
sakalaśāstramatabhramavāraṇam |
sakalavāñchitapūraṇam uttamaṁ |
sakalalokamanaḥ śrutirāṅjanam || 1,1.21 |
vividhasaṁśayaśalyasamuddharam |
śravaṇamātrata eva kubuddhihṛt |
madanakopamukhāribhayāpaham |
jayati śāstram idaṁ kavibhūṣaṇam || 1,1.22 |

11 The dialogue setting never gets completely forgotten since “Suvrata said” is frequently inserted and the narration time and again includes vocatives addressed to the listening king.

The other possibility is that Śatānanda is *not* the author of the frame story. The later redactor would be a second author and may perhaps have been Suvrata or somebody in the service of the king, possibly Śatānanda at a later time in his life, i. e., after the recitation. The second author would have added this frame story to an earlier version of the Satsaṅgijīvanam.¹² If outline and content of the Satsaṅgijīvanam suggest an editorial addition in the case of the frame story, one cannot be certain about which words, lines or chapters stem from Śatānanda, and which from the secondary author or authors. Secondary authorship could also have occurred several times; such is difficult to discover and to identify unless there are manuscripts from different hands.

Thus, from the point of view of authorship the interpretation of what the text says becomes complex, since the narrative is not presented by the author; rather it is embedded in a dialogue between a king and Suvrata, one of Śatānanda's disciples who tells us that he heard the work several times. If Suvrata is a historical personality and if the recitation is also historical, we arrive at having a Satsaṅgijīvanam within a Satsaṅgijīvanam. Of which one is Śatānanda the author?

According to Suvrata, only the passages recited to the king are by Śatānanda, while the frame story would have to be added by somebody else who cannot have been Suvrata. If, on the other hand, Śatānanda is the author also of the frame story, he would have included a future¹³ (if Suvrata's recitation did actually take place) or a fictitious and invented event; but as a reader and historian one is then confronted with the question of how to distinguish historical fact from narrative embellishment, fantasy or fiction.

To continue the summary, chapter 2 tells about Śatānanda's qualifications and sources. The non-identified narrator reports the king's questions and his inquiry about Śatānanda-Muni and introduces Suvrata's report. Śatānanda stems from Mithilā. He knows the Vedas, Śāstras, Purāṇas and Pañcarātra and he regularly reads the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. He learns from this text that Nara-Nārāyaṇa resides in India and therefore goes on a pilgrimage to Badarikā where he worships Nara-Nārāyaṇa. He recites the 10th skandha of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa for six months. Eventually he is granted the Lord's vision. Śatānanda prostrates and praises the Lord with a hymn.

¹² These are the kind of processes to be expected in a Purāṇa.

¹³ For a text which follows the conventions of a literary genre that does not want or need to be 'historical' (e. g. a Purāṇa, hagiography, etc.) the text-critical method cannot do justice neither to the author's intentions nor to the expectations of the audience.

The words of this hymn form the beginning of chapter 3. Śātānanda is here talking about himself in third person. Nara-Nārāyaṇa tells Śātānanda (1,3.15–19) about his birth in Uttara-Kosala and that he presently lives in West-Pañcāla; he prophesies that Śātānanda will create a book about his deeds.¹⁴ The book referred to of course is the Satsaṅgijīvanam. Authorship of the Satsaṅgijīvanam is attributed to a divine boon.

The episode continues by narrating (1,3.34–41) that a little later Śātānanda achieves meditative trance even without practice of Yoga and has a vision of the Lord of Badarī; he is shown the Lord's heavenly abodes (Akṣara-Dhāman, Goloka, Vaikuṇṭha, Śvetadvīpa) and he sees how his parents manifested themselves and he beholds the men and women who are his devotees. Śātānanda receives omniscience about past, present and future. Next (1,3.44–46) Hari grants a boon and orders Śātānanda to go with him to Durgapattanam where he will have a temple built for Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa; there Śātānanda will create a work (*śāstra*) about his experiences. The next verses (1,3.47–48) relate that Śātānanda acted accordingly and produced the Dharmaśāstra Satsaṅgijīvanam in the temple of Śrīgopīnātha. The chapter ends (1,3.51) with an appeal to listen to the work.¹⁵

- 14 *ity uktavantaṃ bhagavāṃs tam uvāca mahāmatim |*
brahmaṃs tvayā vyavasitaṃ saṃyag etan mumukṣuṇā || 1,3.15 |
kiṃtv ahaṃ sāmprataṃ bhūmau kosalesūttareṣv iha |
jāto 'smi dharmato bhaktau harināmnā hi viśrutaḥ || 1,3.16 |
varte paścimapañcāladeśe durgapure 'dhunā
so 'haṃ tvām antike svasya rakṣiṣyāmi na saṃśayaḥ || 1,3.17 |
maḍiyaguṇagāneccā vartate tava hṛdy ataḥ |
tasya me tvaṃ caritrāṇāṃ granthakartā bhaviṣyasi || 1,3.18 |
so 'haṃ pūrṇaṃ kariṣyāmi tvadvāñchitam atas tvayā |
so 'nveṣya prāpya ity uktvā bhagavān sa tiro dadhe || 1,3.19 |

Note on the places mentioned in v. 17: Paścimapañcāla is the Ahmedabad Region; Durgapura (also called Durgapattana) is Gaḍhāḍā.

- 15 *kālenālpena ca hareḥ kṛpayā tasya saddhiyaḥ |*
samādhisiddhir aṣṭāṅgayogābhyāsaṃ vinābhavat || 1,3.34 |
dhyāyaṃs taṃ hṛdi so 'drākṣid prāgdrṣṭaṃ badarīśvaram |
kṣaṇānte 'ntarhitaḥ so 'tha yathā saudāmanī divi || 1,3.35 |
jyotirmaye 'kṣare dhāmni sthitaṃ taṃ kṛṣṇam aikṣata |
samagraiśvaryaṣaṇṇaṃ sapārśadaparigrahaṃ || 1,3.36 |
golokam atha vaikuṇṭhaṃ śvetadvīpādi dhāma yat |
tadaikṣayat sahaīśvaryaṃ haris tasmā alaukikam || 1,3.37 |
yathā svayaṃ cāvīr āsīd dharmo bhaktis tatharṣayaḥ |
teṣāṃ rupaṃ yathā pūrvam atratyaṃ cāpy abūbudhat || 1,3.38 |
svasya bhaktāś ca ye bhūmau puruṣā yoṣitas tathā |
api teṣāṃ ubhe rūpe tasmai harir ajijñapat || 1,3.39 |

The actual writing at this point is a future event which is related in part 5 of the Satsaṅgijīvanam (5,49–50). As early as here it is said that after Swaminarayana's disappearance from this world Śātānanda recited it several times in front of Suvrata and others.

By writing about the events in Swaminarayana's life, Śātānanda acts as a chronicler and historian. For one part of the reported events he was an eye witness. But what were his sources for events which happened before Śātānanda joined and followed Swaminarayana? The narrator seems to anticipate the historian's dilemma. If Śātānanda is to write about events of the past which he has not experienced he needs to have access to the missing information. By being granted omniscience Śātānanda receives knowledge also about the past, that is to say, access to the historical information that he will need to write the book.

The text does not mention, when exactly in Śātānanda's life Swaminarayana's prophesy – during the visit and vision at Badarika – had happened. Part 2 of the

janmakarmādi teṣāṃ ca svasyaiśvaryaṃ ca sarvaśaḥ |
 bhūtaṃ bhavad bhaviṣyaṃ yat taj jñānaṃ pradadau prabhuḥ || 1,3.40 |
 tato 'bhūt so 'pi sarvajñaḥ śātānando mahāmatiḥ |
 yathāvat tat sarvam avain maitreyaṃ svam ṛṣiṃ tathā || 1,3.41 |
 so 'tha prītamanā varṇī tadīyaguṇavarṇanaiḥ |
 sviyaṃ jñānaṃ tathā vidyāḥ saphalikartum āha tam || 1,3.42 |
 tvadyaśogumphanenaiva prabandhair vividhaiḥ prabho |
 svajnānaṃ saphalikartum utkāyājñāṃ tu dehi me || 1,3.43 |
 iti niṣkapaṭaṃ tena yācito harir āha tam |
 manoratho 'yaṃ saphalo bhaviṣyati tava dvija || 1,3.44 |
 āyāhi tvaṃ mayā sākāṃ durgapattanam uttamam |
 tatrāhaṃ kārayiṣyāmi rādhākṛṣṇasya mandiram || 1,3.45 |
 tatratīpāvane kṣetre vasaṃs tvaṃ sthīramānasaḥ |
 śāstraṃ viracayer varṇin yathātmānubhavaṃ mama || 1,3.46 |
 ity anujñāta īśena hṛṣṭaḥ sa kṛtavāṃs tathā |
 sākāṃ bhagavatā durgapuram etya āvasac ciram || 1,3.47 |
 satsaṅgijīvanam nāma dharmasāstraṃ idaṃ hi saḥ |
 harilīlāmayam cakre śṛṅgopīnāthamandire || 1,3.48 |
 śodhayitvātha tadbhaktān harer matpramukhān vidaḥ |
 katicit pāthayām āsa viprān antarahite harau || 1,3.49 |
 iti te kathitaṃ bhūpa janmakarmādi me guroḥ |
 satsaṅgijīvanam atho sacchāstraṃ vacmi tatkr̥tam || 1,3.50 |
 sakaladharmabhṛtaṃ harilīlayā |
 samupabṛṃhitam etad ihādbhutam |
 rasavidāṃ bhuvi mānasarañjanam |
 kalimalopaśamaṃ śṛṇu sādaram || 1,3.51 |

Satsaṅgijīvanam however mentions that the first meeting of Śātānanda¹⁶ with Swaminarayana in Darbhavati took place in 1814 A.D. This means that all the events prior to this date are known to Śātānanda by hearsay. Śātānanda became Swaminarayana's disciple 14 years before the composition of the Satsaṅgijīvanam in 1828. With Swaminarayana's boon in mind he could have consciously and systematically collected information during these 14 years.

Śātānanda is mentioned again as the author of the Satsaṅgijīvanam in part 3.¹⁷ At the beginning (ch. 3,2) it deals with arrangements for serving Swaminarayana. The list includes the services of Śātānanda-Muni as editor (*śodhayām āsa*) of eight sacred texts composed by Śrī-Hari¹⁸ and as the author of the Satsaṅgijīvanam (see 3,2.29–30; 3,2.51b). The Satsaṅgijīvanam is distinguished from the class of these eight works by not being attributed to Swaminarayana. The eight works are not identified by title; Śātānanda again refers to himself in third person and the Sanskrit verb used to express Swaminarayana's literary activity is a causative form: "The knowledgeable Śātānanda carefully redacted the eight true Śāstras which Hari had caused to be written (*lekhitāni*) earlier." (3,2.29)¹⁹

3 The episode of Swaminarayana writing the Śikṣāpatrī

The writing of the Satsaṅgijīvanam is mentioned again in part 4, in anticipation of the actual event. This part of the Satsaṅgijīvanam forestalls Swaminarayana's demise in a chapter on his secret resolve (4,24). The text narrates about Swaminarayana's thoughts and intentions; and what on the literary level appears as the technique of the omniscient narrator, implies for the historian that Swaminarayana must at some point have told Śātānanda about these intentions. The following is a summary of the contents of chapter 4,24:

¹⁶ He is referred to as "Suvrata's master"; this reminds the readers or the audience that they are listening to Suvrata's recital of the Satsaṅgijīvanam, not to Śātānanda himself.

¹⁷ For a survey of the contents of the Satsaṅgijīvanam, see above, footnote 7. Altogether Śātānanda is mentioned by name 30 times.

¹⁸ (Śrī-)Hari is how the Satsaṅgijīvanam generally refers to Swaminarayana.

¹⁹ *hariṇā lekhitāny aṣṭa sacchāstrāṇi tadagrataḥ |*
śātānando mahābuddhiḥ śodhayām āsa cāñjasā || 3,2.29 |
ya idaṃ vidadhe prītyā hariṇilopabṛṃhitam |
satsaṅgijīvanam rāmyaṃ jīvātum harisevinām || 3,2.30 |

Śrī-Hari recollects the motive of his incarnation: In the Kali-period adharma and vices had increased and dharma had deteriorated. Gods and sages were afflicted and the earth was unable to bear the burden of sinners. After having taken human birth due to the curse of Durvāsas, he destroyed evils and established dharma and devotion. Monks, gods and ascetics were delighted. The people of the four castes worshipped him, but they end up without any support after his disappearance. He wishes to support his followers in three ways (4,24.1–8): (1) Construction of the temples for installing his images, (2) appointment of a religious teacher (*guru*) from Dharma's family to increase devotion (cf. SSJ 4,40 f.); (3) composition of a book by Śātānanda dealing with his life and works, i. e. the Satsaṅgijīvanam. The purport of the Satsaṅgijīvanam is said to serve as the source-text containing the principles of all authoritative texts. After that (so Swaminarayana's thoughts continue) he will return to his abode (*dhāman*) (4,24.10–14).²⁰ Then Śrī-Hari causes the scribes to copy (*lekhayām āsa*) authoritative texts.²¹

From the point of view of narrative technique this is an anticipating reference. Writing the Satsaṅgijīvanam falls under the measures taken to ensure the thriving of the movement after Swaminarayana's death. Since part 4 narrates about the construction of temples (first resolve) and the appointment of Ācāryas (ch. 4,40, realization of the second resolve) it seems plausible to read SSJ 4,43–44 as an account of the realization of the third resolve. These chapters relate the writing of the Śikṣāpatrī, not of the Satsaṅgijīvanam.

To continue the summary, the account about the writing of Śikṣāpatrī is embedded in reports about listening to recitations of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. On the next day Śrī-Hari thinks about writing down a document (*patrikā*) to instruct dharma to his devotees of all regions so that after his departure they can practice

-
- 20 *kārayitvā mandirāṇi tatra svapratimā aham |*
sthāpayeya tatas tās ca seviṣyante hi mānavāḥ || 4,24.10 |
svadharme vartamānānāṃ puṃsāṃ tatsevanād iha |
siddhim eṣyati sarveṣāṃ puruṣārthacatuṣṭayam || 4,24.11 |
bhaktimārgasya puṣṭyartham mantradikṣā apy apekṣyate |
ato dharmānvaye śuddhe gurutām sthāpayeya ca || 4,24.12 |
dharmajñānaviraktinām bhakteś cāvagamāya tu |
grantham kartā śātānando maccharitropabhīhitam || 4,24.13 |
siddhāntam sarvaśāstrāṇām tena jñāsyanti macchritāḥ |
evam eva tataḥ kṛtvā yāyām dhāma svakaṃ bhuvāḥ || 4,24.14 |
 21 *svrāta uvāca: sa evaṃ gūḍhasaṃkalpo nivasams tatra pattane |*
lekhayām āsa sarvāṇi sacchāstrāṇi sulekhakaiḥ || 4,24.15 |
 I.e. texts like the Bhāgavatapurāṇa etc. (according to Śukānanda).

it just according to his intention (4,43.18–21). He tells his attendant²² to bring a paper, ink-pot and pen (*lekhinī*) and writes the Śikṣāpatrī, the essence of all authoritative texts (v. 22–24).²³

What follows as chapter 4,44 is the Sanskrit text of the Śikṣāpatrī comprising 212 verses. Swaminarayana mentions himself by name (Sahajānanda) and writes in first person (*likhāmi*). He characterizes the text as a summary of the prescriptions of the dharma which all of his followers should obey; he is contemplating Śrī-Kṛṣṇa with Rādhā and Lakṣmī in Vāḍatāla and writes the Śikṣāpatrī for all his followers who live in different regions. He blesses his two (adopted) sons, celibates like Mukundānanda etc., householders like Mayarāma etc., married women, widows, and monks like Muktānanda etc., because they protect devotedly their dharma according to the authoritative texts. The Śikṣāpatrī brings benefit to all beings. Those who observe the good conduct of the authoritative texts will get happiness, but the evil-minded people who fail to observe it will get misery. His disciples should follow it carefully (v. 1–10).²⁴

²² The commentator Śukānanda says that this was Śukānanda, i. e. himself, which is a verification of Śatānanda's report by an independent witness.

- ²³ *aparāhṇe tataḥ svāmī vijanastho hitaṃ nṛṇāṃ |*
cintayan patrikāṃ tebhya likhituṃ nīcikāya saḥ || 4,43.18 |
sakaleśv api deśeṣu dharmasikṣārthapatrikāṃ |
likhāmi tena madbhaktā vartīṣyante tathaiva hi || 4,43.19 |
mamāśayo yādṛśo 'sti tādṛśaṃ cāpi te 'khlāḥ |
tayaivāvagamīṣyanti bhaviṣyanty apy asaṃśayāḥ || 4,43.20 |
antarhite mayi bhuvō madīyānāṃ ca sarvaśaḥ |
sphuṭamadvākyarūpā sā bhavitry ālambanaṃ bhuvi || 4,43.21 |
evaṃ vicārya dharmātmā kākudaṃ khaṭikāṃ ca saḥ |
ānayām āsa bhṛtyena lekhinīṃ ca suśobhanāṃ || 4,43.22 |
sacchāstrāṇāṃ sa sarveṣāṃ sārāṃ ākṣya saddhiyā |
lilekha patrikāṃ svāmī saddharmaṃ sthāpayan bhuvi || 4,43.23 |
ūrau dakṣe paṭṭakaṃ kākudasya |
kṛtvā dhṛtvā vāmaḍoṣṇā natāsyāḥ |
dakṣe pāṇau lekhinīṃ kuñcitāgre |
bibhrat patrīṃ so 'likhad bhūmipettham || 4,43.24 |
- ²⁴ *vāme yasya sthitā rādhā śrīś ca yasyāsti vakṣasi |*
vṃdāvanavihāraṃ taṃ śrīkṛṣṇaṃ hṛdī cintaye || 4,44.1 |
likhāmi sahajānandasvāmī sarvān nijāśrītān |
nānādeśasthitān śikṣāpatrīṃ vṛttālayasthitaḥ || 4,44.2 |
bhrātro rāmapratāpeccāramāyora dharmajanmanoh |
yāv ayodhyāprasādākhya raghuvirābhidhau sutau || 4,44.3 |
mukundānandamukhyāś ca naiṣṭhikā brahmacāriṇaḥ |
gr̥hasthāś ca mayārāma bhāṭṭādyā ye madāśrayāḥ || 4,44.4 |
sadhavā vidhavā yoṣā yāś ca macchiṣyatāṃ gatāḥ |
muktānandādayo ye syuḥ sādharmaś cākhilā api || 4,44.5 |

He repeats this characterization of the Śikṣāpatrī at its end (4,44.203–204): he has written down in short the essence of all authoritative texts; his followers may see details from those texts. His followers should behave according to the Śikṣāpatrī, otherwise they will be considered as expelled. They should read or listen to it daily (v. 205–210). Eventually, the writing is unambiguously dated (v. 211): The Śikṣāpatrī is written on the 5th day called Vasantapañcamī of bright Māgha in VS 1882, i. e. 1825 A.D. The chapter ends with a benedictory stanza praying to Śrī-Kṛṣṇa to bestow blessings.²⁵

At the beginning of the next chapter, Śātānanda's text supplies further details about the spread of this quoted text (4,45.1–4):²⁶ After writing down

-
- svadharmarakṣikā me taiḥ sarvair vācyāḥ sadāśiṣaḥ |*
śrīmannārāyaṇasmṛtyā sahitaḥ śāstrasammatāḥ || 4,44.6 |
ekāgreṇaiva manasā patrīlekhaḥ sahetukaḥ |
avadhāryo 'yam akhilaḥ sarvajīvaḥ itāhvah || 4,44.7 |
ye pālayanti manuḥ śacchāstrapratipāditān |
sadācārān sadā te 'tra paratra ca mahāsukhāḥ || 4,44.8 |
tān ullāṅghya vartante ye tu svairam kubuddhayaḥ |
ta ihāmutra ca mahat labhante kaṣṭam eva hi || 4,44.9 |
ato bhavadbhir macchiṣyāḥ sāvadhānatayākhilāḥ |
prītyaitām anusṛtyaiva vartitavyaṁ nīrantaram || 4,44.10 |
25 *iti saṁkṣepato dharmāḥ sarveṣāṁ likhitā mayā |*
sāmpradāyikagranthebhyo jñeya eṣāṁ tu vistaraḥ || 4,44.203 |
sacchāstrāṇāṁ samuddhṛtya sarveṣāṁ saram ātmanā |
patrīyaṁ likhitā nīṇām abhiṣṭaphaladāyini || 4,44.204 |
imām eva tato nityam anusṛtya mamāśritaiḥ |
yatātmabhir vartitavyaṁ na tu svairam kadācana || 4,44.205 |
vartīṣyante ya itthaṁ hi puruṣa yōṣitaḥ tathā |
te dharmādicaturvargasiddhiṁ prāpsyanti nīcitam || 4,44.206 |
netthaṁ ya ācariṣyanti te tv asmatsampradāyataḥ |
bahirbhūtā iti jñeyaṁ strīpūṁsaiḥ sāmpradāyikaiḥ || 4,44.207 |
śikṣāpatryāḥ pratidinam pāṭho 'syā madupāśritaiḥ |
kartavyo 'nakṣarajñais tu śravaṇaṁ kāryam ādarāt || 4,44.208 |
vaktrabhāve tu pujaiva kāryāsyāḥ prativāsaram |
madrūpam iti madvāṇī mānyeyaṁ paramādarāt || 4,44.209 |
yuktāya saṁpadā daivyā dātavyeyaṁ tu patrikā |
āsuryā saṁpadādḥyāya puṁse deyā na karhicit || 4,44.210 |
vikramārkaśakasyābde netrāṣṭavasubhūmite |
vasantādyadine śikṣāpatrīyaṁ likhitā mayā || 4,44.211 |
nijāśrītānāṁ sakalārtihantā |
sadharmabhakter avanaṁ vidhātā |
dātā sukhānāṁ manasepsitānāṁ |
tanotu kṛṣṇo 'khilamaṅgalaṁ naḥ || 4,44.212 |
26 *svrata uvāca: likhitvā patrikāṁ itthaṁ tasyāś ca pratimāṣṭakam |*
sādhubhiḥ kārayitvāsau praiṣayat kakubho 'ṣṭa saḥ || 4,45.1 |

the Śikṣāpatrī and telling the monks to write eight copies of it, Śrī-Hari sends the copies to the devotees in eight directions. Recognizing him as Kṛṣṇa the devotees make their own copy and behave accordingly. After sending the copies, Śrī-Hari, surrounded by some of his devotees, goes to Ahmedabad (*śrīnagara*).

There is no doubt that Swaminarayana is depicted as the author of the Śikṣāpatrī; he is writing the original manuscript with his own hand. It is neither mentioned in which language he wrote nor which literary form he chose (prose or verses).

4 Śātānanda as author of the Śikṣāpatrī

To recapitulate: If interpreted as historical evidence, the episode reported in SSJ 4,24 and 4,43–44 (summarized in the previous section) about authorship and origin of Śikṣāpatrī is straightforward: In the Satsaṅgijīvanam as a work authored by Śātānanda, the Śikṣāpatrī is inserted²⁷ as a quoted text; its author is not Śātānanda, but Swaminarayana (i. e., Sahajānanda).

But the origin of Satsaṅgijīvanam and of the Śikṣāpatrī it contains is told again at the end of part 5.²⁸ Chapter 56 introduces, for the first time, Śātānanda as somebody who poses questions to Swaminarayana and motivates instruction about a specific topic. The Satsaṅgijīvanam here becomes autobiographical. The subject matter inquired about is yoga. Śātānanda refers to the fact that he is among those people who experienced samādhi spontaneously, i. e., without yogic training, but induced by Swaminarayana. This is the only statement by Śātānanda about himself in first person. Probably the event refers to the meeting in Badarīka (5,56.1–7).²⁹

tatra tatra ca tām prāpya bhaktāḥ prāpur mudam parām |
kṛtvā tatpratimāṃ sarve pṛthak pṛthag adhārayan || 4,45.2 |
taduktariṭyā sarve ca svādhikārānusārataḥ |
avartanta ca taṃ bhejur jānantaḥ kṛṣṇam eva te || 4,45.3 |
patrikāṃ preṣayitvātha bhaktaiḥ katipayair vṛtaḥ |
hariḥ śrīnagaraṃ bhūyo jagāmanāndayan nijān || 4,45.4 |

²⁷ On 4,44.1 the commentary *Bhāvaprabodhīnī* notes that Śikṣāpatrī is here “joined” (*saṃyojyate*) as chapter 44 of the Satsaṅgijīvanam by Śātānanda-Muni. The terminology suggests the independent existence of Śikṣāpatrī but also the identity of the text written by Swaminarayana with the wording included in the Satsaṅgijīvanam.

²⁸ Part 5 deals mainly with the dharma of various groups of society, interspersed with chapters on the installation of images in temples (see above, footnote 7).

²⁹ *suṇvata uvāca: kṛṣṇetarapadārtheṣu ruciḥnāsya sarvathā |*
dharmādīpracchake ’thāsīt puṃsi prītir harer nṛpa || 5,56.1 |

Nine chapters further (5,66), i. e., after citing what Swaminarayana had to say about yoga, Śātānanda reminds Swaminarayana of the boon which he had received at Badarīka: As Śrī-Hari had promised³⁰ he should allow him to compose a work on Śrī-Hari's life and deeds. Swaminarayana answers by bestowing the knowledge of past, present and future and he permits Śātānanda to write a work which will be a support for his followers after his disappearance.³¹ Śātānanda should stay in Gopīnātha's temple and render first the Śikṣāpatrī in verses of Anuṣṭubh meter. Śātānanda-Muni is pleased and Śrī-Hari retires to his residence. The concluding verse of the chapter tells that Śātānanda-Muni, considering Śrī-Hari's command as an auspicious time, starts rendering the Śikṣāpatrī in verses (5,66.25–35).³²

śātānando munis tasya sevāyām nirataḥ sadā |
pādasamvāhanaṁ kurvann ekadāsīt tadantike || 5,56.2 |
taṁ uvāca svayaṁ svāmi mune kiñcana te yadi |
praṣṭavyaṁ syāt tadaitarhi pṛccha vakṣye taduttaram || 5,56.3 |
evam uktaḥ sa tu prīto bhṛṣaṁ munir udāradhiḥ |
prāñjalis taṁ namaskṛtya papracchetthaṁ narādhipa || 5,56.4 |
śātānanda uvāca: sāṅgaṁ yogam ahaṁ svāmin boddhum icchāmi tattvataḥ |
tvatta eva hi sarvajñāt sevaniyāc ca yogibhiḥ || 5,56.5 |
mayā tu tvatprasādena yoginām api durlabhāḥ |
samādhisiddhiḥ prāptāsti vinā sādhanasampadam || 5,56.6 |
tathāpi lakṣaṇādīni yogaśāstrānusārataḥ |
vivitsāmy aṅgiyogasya tadaṅgānāṁ ca sarvaśaḥ || 5,56.7

30 See SSJ 1,3, and above, Section 2.

31 This refers to the second of the secret intentions from 4,24.

32 *śātānanda uvāca: prasanno yadi me svāmiṁs tarhi tvam kṛpayādya hi |*
manorathaṁ ciratnaṁ me sampūrayitum arhasi || 5,66.25 |
tvaccaritrāgranthaṁ ahaṁ cikīrṣāmi jagadguro |
tad ājñāṁ dehi me pūrvaṁ bhavatāsti pratiśrutam || 5,66.26 |
saphalas tena bhavitā vidyābhyāsaśramo mama |
ity abhiṣṭaṁ hi me dehi bhaktābhiṣṭaprado 'si hi || 5,66.27 |
ity arthitaḥ sa muninā premabhaktena dhīmatā |
prasannaḥ prāha taṁ yogin kuru granthaṁ svavāñchitam || 5,66.28 |
yathāśrutam yathādrṣṭaṁ caritraṁ mama varṇaya |
jñānaṁ traikālikam buddhau bhavaty eva tavānagha || 5,66.29 |
manaḥsthān apy abhiprāyān sarveṣāṁ vetsyasi dhruvam |
na te tv aviditaṁ kiñcid bhavitātipriyo 'si me || 5,66.30 |
antarhite mayi bhuvo macchritānāṁ nṛṇāṁ mune |
vatkṛto grantha evātra bhaviṣyaty āśrayo mahān || 5,66.31 |
śikṣāpatrīm mallikhitām grathānādaṁ tvam añjasā |
padayair ānuṣṭubhair eva mahāgranthaṁ tataḥ kuru || 5,66.32 |
vijane hi sthirā buddhiḥ syād ataḥ kṛṣṇamandire |
vāsocitāsti kuṭy ekā tatraiva nivaser mune || 5,66.33 |

As historical information about the authorship of the text of the Śikṣāpatrī (which forms ch. 4,44 of the Satsaṅgijīvanam), this passage is indeed crucial for the argument of this paper. The relevant verses in translation read:

- 28cd. Graciously he said to him: “Yogin, make the book which you desire to make.
 29. Describe my life and actions (*caritram*) as you have heard about it and seen it. In your mind (*buddhi*) exists the knowledge about past, present and future, o sinless one.
 30. You shall certainly know also the intentions that are in the mind of everybody; nothing will remain unknown to you. You are extremely dear to me.
 31. Once I have disappeared from this world, the book made by you shall be a great support for people who have taken refuge to me, o sage.
 32. At first you shall straightaway string together (compose) the Śikṣāpatrī (“letter of instruction”) that was written by myself, exclusively in *anuṣṭubh* verses; then you shall make the large book.
 33. The mind is stable only in a lonely place; therefore a single room in the Kṛṣṇa-temple is adequate as residence; you should reside there only, o sage.”
 34. (Suvrata said:) Thus addressed by Hari, the sage became even more pleased. He bowed before him and went to his own residence, o king.
 35. The sage acknowledged that Hari’s command was an auspicious occasion (*muhūrta*), took residence in a lovely room in the Kṛṣṇa-temple and then attentively composed the letter of instruction.

This means that in 1828 Śātānanda had not started writing the Satsaṅgijīvanam. Chapter 5,67 is very specific in narrating that he began the work with what is now chapter 44 of the 4th part: Suvrata relates that from the 13th day called “Dhanatrayodaśī”³³ till the 2nd day called “Yamadviṭīyā”³⁴ Śātānanda-Muni renders the Śikṣāpatrī in 212 verses; then he writes a commentary on it; after completing it on the 5th day of bright Mārgaśīrṣa (*sahas*) he submits it to Śrī-Hari in the assembly. Śrī-Hari is satisfied, appreciates him and bestows blessings by putting his hands on his head. On Śrī-Hari’s command Nityānanda-Muni reads the Śikṣāpatrī³⁵ in the assembly (5,67.1–8).³⁶

suvrata uvāca: evam uktaḥ sa hariṇā muniḥ prītataro ’bhavat |
taṃ praṇāmya nījāvāsam upeyāya narādhipa || 5,66.34 |
ajñā harer eva śubhaṃ muhūrtam |
vidan sa kṛṣṇālayaramyakṛtyām |
kṛtvā svavāsam ca tadaiva śikṣā- |
patrīṃ munir granthitum udyato ’bhūt || 5,66.35 |

33 Of dark Āśvina VS 1885 (1828 AD) (Śukānanda).

34 Of bright Kārttika.

35 Its Sanskrit version in verses.

36 *suvrata uvāca: trayodaśī dhanādyāsīt tadāniṃ nṛpasattama |*
śikṣāpatrīṃ samārebhe sa tasyām granthitum muniḥ || 5,67.1 |

Śrī-Nārāyaṇa-Muni says that the followers, after the daily obligations, should sit in Svastika posture and recite it slowly understanding its meaning in the morning or at night (5,67.9–12).³⁷ The devotees accept his words. Śrī-Hari allows Śatānanda-Muni to compose the great work. After acquiring omniscience from Śrī-Hari he composes a chapter and reads it in the presence of Śrī-Hari and monks like Śukānanda etc. Śrī-Hari is satisfied (5,67.13–19).³⁸

The text continues by relating further recitations of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and about miracles attributed to the temple images. Thus one and a half years

-
- pūrnā yamadvitiyāyām sā kṛtā tena saddhiyā |*
ślokāḥ śatadvayaṃ tasyā āsaṃś ca dvādaśottaram || 5,67.2 |
tataḥ sa bhagavatprītyai tasyāḥ tīkāṃ ca śobhanām |
arebhe tāṃ sahomāse pañcamyām ca samāpayat || 5,67.3 |
tasyām eva tithau rājann aparāhṇe samāpayat |
haraye munibhiḥ sākam upaviṣṭāya saṃsadi || 5,67.4 |
saṭikāṃ patrikāṃ svīyāṃ dṛṣtvā tāṃ saṃtutoṣa saḥ |
praśaṃsāṃ bahudhā cakre śatānandasya saṃsadi || 5,67.5 |
yāvān mādiyo 'bhiprāya āsīt tāvān aśeṣataḥ |
atrānīto 'sty aneneti munīn bhaktāṃś ca so 'vadat || 5,67.6 |
prītyā dadau svakaṇṭhassthāṃ śatānandāya sa srajam |
karadvayaṃ cātimudā dadhau tacchirasi prabhuḥ || 5,67.7 |
tatas tāṃ vācayām āsa nityānandena saṃsadi |
harir bhaktāś ca munayaḥ śrutvā tāṃ jahṛṣur nṛpa || 5,67.8 |
37 *tataḥ prāha hariḥ sarvān bhaktān śṛṇutākhlilāḥ |*
ye syur mādiyās tair eṣā pāṭhyā śravyāthavānvaham || 5,67.9 |
prāg eva bhojanān nityaṃ śucibhiḥ svastikāsanam |
samāsthītaiḥ iyaṃ pāṭhyā tato bhojyam anāpadi || 5,67.10 |
divānukūlyābhāve tu niśi nityavidhiṃ nijam |
kṛtvāikatra niṣadyaiva paṭhanīyeyam ādarāt || 5,67.11 |
yathaitadarthasphuraṇaṃ hṛdi svasya bhavet tathā |
śanaiḥ sphuṭākṣaraṃ pāṭhyā nityam eva madāśritaiḥ || 5,67.12 |
38 *iti śrutvā harer vākyaṃ sarve bhaktajanās tadā |*
evam eva kariṣyāmo vyaṃ ity ūcur ānatāḥ || 5,67.13 |
tato hariḥ śatānandaṃ prāha svābhīṣṭam uttamam |
kuru granthaṃ mahābuddhe samartho 'si hi tatkr̥tau || 5,67.14 |
kṣṇaprasādalabdhaiva buddhis te 'stīti bhāti naḥ |
anyathā madabhiprāyam evaṃ vaktuṃ kṣameta kaḥ || 5,67.15 |
sa ity ukto bhagavatā taṃ praṇamya nijāśramam |
ayayau durlabhaṃ devaiḥ saṃprāptas tadanugrahaṃ || 5,67.16 |
hariprasādasamprāptasārvajñayaḥ so 'tha yogirāt |
campāśaṣṭhyāṃ samārebhe idaṃ satsaṅgijīvanam || 5,67.17 |
ekaikaṃ ca prakaraṇaṃ kṛtvā saṃpūrṇam īśvaram |
taṃ eva śrāvayām āsa nijāvāsasthitaṃ muniḥ || 5,67.18 |
sa śuśrāvādarāt sākāṃ nityaṃ svāntikavāsibhiḥ |
śukānandādīmuniḥ tena tuṣṭo 'bhavad bhṛśam || 5,67.19 |

pass (5,67.19–40). This reads like an indication of how long it took him to write the Satsaṅgijīvanam.

The beginning of the next chapter (SSJ 5,68) tells that all of these events and details are linked with the impending departure of Swaminarayana. Suvrata's report reviews Swaminarayana's achievements. The circumstances justify his departure. To summarize:

At the end of the night of the 9th day of bright Jyeṣṭha Śrī-Hari ponders again about the completion of all deeds in human form: non-righteous teachers and kings are refuted; greed etc. are eradicated from people's hearts through the authoritative texts and through his own power; truth, non-stealing etc. have been established on earth; devotion accompanied by dharma, knowledge and detachment is propagated; Dharma, Mūrti, Uddhava and other sages are freed from Durvāsas' curse; knowledge of Brahman, Yogic techniques, sacrifices without violence, faith in gods, Brahmins and holy places are strengthened; doctrines of Kaulas and non-believers are refuted; images of Nara-Nārāyaṇa etc. are installed in temples; ranks of the religious masters and initiation ceremony are established; Śikṣāpatrī is composed; dharmas of men, women and monks etc., yoga with eight steps and regulations for vows and festivals are imparted; Śātānanda-Muni's work for the benefit of mankind comes close to completion (*samāptaprāyaḥ*). He should now bestow peace on the affectionate devotees and return to his abode (5,68.1–19).³⁹

-
- 39 *svrata uvāca: navamyām atha śuklāyāṃ jyeṣṭhasya sa niśātyaye |*
vicāram akarod bhūya ātmanātmāni bhūpate || 5,68.1 |
mayā dhr̥to 'vatāro 'yaṃ yadārthaṃ tad aśeṣataḥ |
kāryaṃ kṛtaṃ bhūtale 'tra na kiñcid avaśeṣitam || 5,68.2 |
adhārmikā gurvasurā dharmasādhudruho nṛpāḥ |
pratāpena mayā svasya parastāḥ sakalā api || 5,68.3 |
adharmavaṃśyā lobherṣyākāmakrodhādayo 'pi ca |
sacchāstrasvapratāpābhyām utkhātā hṛdayān nṛṇām || 5,68.4 |
satyāsteyabrahmacaryadayādyā dharmavaṃśajāḥ |
sthāpitā hṛdaye nṛṇām mayā samyag dharātale || 5,68.5 |
svadharmajñānavairāgyayuktā bhaktiś ca sarvataḥ |
pravartitā pratigṛhaṃ nṛṇām niḥśreyasāya ca || 5,68.6 |
dharmo mūrtiś coddhavaś ca durvāsaḥśāpato mayā |
mocitāś carṣayaḥ prāyo mucyamānās tathetare || 5,68.7 |
brahmavidyāś ca sakalā nānāyogakalās tathā |
pravartitāḥ pratijānam ahiṃsāś ca makhā bhuvī || 5,68.8 |
devabrāhmaṇatīrthānām nīgamānām satām tathā |
pravartitā mānyatā ca sacchāstrāṇām ca sarvathā || 5,68.9 |
asacchāstrasya kaulāder nāstikānām matasya ca |
vidhāya khaṇḍanaṃ dharmāḥ sthāpito 'tra sanātanaḥ || 5,68.10 |
vidhāpya mandirāṇy atra svāśritānām sukhāya ca |

A few points from this account deserve further attention: Swaminarayana's words to Śatānanda which formulate the task of writing the Satsaṅgijīvanam and of beginning with the Śikṣāpatrī (5,66.28–33) use the verb *grath* for the literary activity demanded. This generally means “to compose, to string together”. The apposition “in anuṣṭubh verses” could be a syntactical characterization of the Śikṣāpatrī as written by Swaminarayana or of how Śatānanda should compose the text. There is no explicit mention of “translation”, but it cannot be excluded that Swaminarayana's text was not only *not* in anuṣṭubh verses but also *not* in Sanskrit. When the narrator (Suvrata) relates that Śatānanda executes the demand, he uses the same verb (*grath*).

We are also told that he worked on the Śikṣāpatrī for five days; if Śatānanda only had to *copy* 212 verses, this emphasis on the brevity of the period would be incomprehensible. If he reformulated a *prose* Sanskrit text the contradiction would be less patent; if he actually *transcreated* the Sanskrit verses from a Gujarati (or Hindi) original, the emphasis would make sense.

The Śikṣāpatrī as discussed in SSJ 4,44 ends with a date: It was written in 1825 in Vṛttālaya. There is no mention here of an intervention by Śatānanda as either redactor or translator. The redaction of Śikṣāpatrī is also dated: 1828 (SSJ 5,67.1); the Śikṣāpatrī thus existed for three years before Śatānanda translated or transcreated it into Sanskrit verses. At that time the Satsaṅgijīvanam was “nearing completion”.⁴⁰

sthāpitā mūrtayaḥ svasya naranārāyaṇādayaḥ || 5,68.11 |
 bhaktimārgapravṛttyartham dharmavaṃśyadvijeṣu ca |
 acāryatā sthāpitātha dīkṣārītiḥ pravartitā || 5,68.12 |
 sadācārapravṛttyartham svāśriteṣu pravartitā |
 sarvasacchāstrasāro hi śikṣāpatrī mayā bhuvi || 5,68.13 |
 varṇinām naiṣṭhikānām ca grhīṇām yoṣitām mayā |
 sādḥūnām itareṣām ca dharmāḥ samyaṅ nirūpitāḥ || 5,68.14 |
 vratotsavānām sarveṣām vidhiś cōkto mayākhilāḥ |
 vidhir aṣṭāṅgayogasya sakalo 'pi nirūpitāḥ || 5,68.15 |
 kalau janiṣyamāṇām śatānandena dehinām |
 uddhṛtyai kārīto granthāḥ samāptapraya eva saḥ || 5,68.16 |
 evam yat sveba kartavyam tat sarvaṃ hi kṛtam mayā |
 ataḥ paraṃ svadhāmaiva gantavyam adhunā bhuvaḥ || 5,68.17 |
 kiṃtv adyaiva tirobhūte mayi sarve madāśritāḥ |
 mayy evātisnehabhājō dehān hāsyanti tat kṣaṇam || 5,68.18 |
 ato madviraham soḍhum akṣamāṇām hi sarvathā |
 teṣām śāntim vidhāyaiva yāyām dhāma nijaṃ param || 5,68.19 |

⁴⁰ It could not have been finished since it includes the events around Swaminarayana's demise, to occur later than the narrated event.

5 Conclusion, questions and prospects

To summarize the evidence collected from the *Satsaṅgijīvanam*: There are two accounts about the origin of Śikṣāpatrī. In the first one Swaminarayana is described as writing the text; in the second one Śātānanda is told to transform this text into Sanskrit verses. Thus, if the specificity of the version inserted in the *Satsaṅgijīvanam* is said to consist in being in Sanskrit and in *anuṣṭubh* verses, the original is likely to be different in both regards and may have been written in Gujarati and in prose. It would follow that the Śikṣāpatrī which followers of Swaminarayana recite is a text written by Śātānanda who did so upon the authority of Swaminarayana. This observation concerns the literary form of the text, not its contents; and even if the literary form is not authored by Swaminarayana, he explicitly approved of it. Pursuing the differentiation of authorship and authority in the reception history of the Śikṣāpatrī in the Swaminarayana Movement, i. e., in commentaries and exegetical literature, might be revealing about the importance of textual traditions and their functions.

The questions raised on account of the origin of the Śikṣāpatrī in the *Satsaṅgijīvanam* about the authorship of the received text of the Śikṣāpatrī concern the historical value of all information in the *Satsaṅgijīvanam*. Episodes with mythological character (involving demons, etc.) may lead to the question as to whether and where to draw a line between history and mythology or legend? And, more importantly, *how* to draw it. A comparison with other biographical sources and accounts would impose itself. There are independent witnesses of some events (Bishop Heber's report, the architectural witnesses of the temples he had built, other texts, etc.).

The *Satsaṅgijīvanam* reports that eight copies of the original Śikṣāpatrī were distributed. Where are these eight copies? There is obviously the possibility (or even probability) that the original might still exist. The eight copies (see SSJ 45,45.1–3) were perhaps not all copied directly from the original; they might represent a small stemma. The search for these manuscripts (and, if successful, their preservation) is a research task which outsiders cannot achieve. The account in the *Satsaṅgijīvanam* justifies an appeal to the authorities of all the branches and dioceses of the Swaminarayana-Movement to undertake this task. To compare them with the Śikṣāpatrī as contained in the *Satsaṅgijīvanam* would be of great text historical interest.

There is no defined process of canonization institutionalized in the movement. The authorization of Śātānanda by Swaminarayana cannot be repeated and lives on in the consensus of the community of followers. Changes are not a

priori excluded unless authorization and authorship are confused or wrongly identified with canonization of texts.

The evidence of the Satsaṅgijīvanam provokes such questions. Answering them is a task for further historical research.

Acknowledgements: The article is based on Peter Schreiner's presentation at the international conference entitled "Sahajanand Swami and the Swaminarayan Sampradaya: Historical, Social and Cultural Perspective" (New Delhi, 1–4 August 2013), organized by the B.A.P.S. Swaminarayan Research Institute. It results from research on the Satsaṅgijīvanam carried out in collaboration with Jaydev A. Jani (M.S. University of Baroda) during a research project at the University of Zürich (Switzerland) between 1992 and 1994. The funding by the Swiss National Research Foundation (*Schweizer National Fonds*) is gratefully acknowledged.

Bibliography of quoted references

- Śrīsatsaṅgijīvanam: Śrīsatānandamuniviracitam : Śrīśukānandamuniviracitayā hetusaṃjñayā ṭīkayā*, Sa. Dha. Dhu. Ācāryaśrīvihārīlālamahārājāviracitayā bhāvaprabodhinyākhyayā vyākhyayā ca sametam : Vṛttālayapāṭhaśālāpradhānapaṇḍitena embār Kṛṣṇamācāryeṇa saṃśodhitam Sa. dha. dhu. ācārya śrī Ajendra Prasādamahārājājñayā sāraṃgapura mandiramukhyāmātyena Śrī Kāthāri Nārāyaṇa Mūnicaraṇadāsena mumbayyām sārīkākhyamudraṇālaye mudrāpya prākāśyaṃ nītam. Saṃvat 2046; san 1987.
- Williams, Raymond Brady (1984): *A New Face of Hinduism : The Swaminarayan Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Raymond Brady/Trivedi, Yogi (eds.) (in press): *Swaminarayan Hinduism: Tradition, Adaptation and Identity*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.